

Detecting Unsolvable Queries for Definite Logic Programs

Maurice Bruynooghe¹, Henk Vandecasteele¹, D. Andre de Waal², and Marc Denecker¹

¹ Departement Computerwetenschappen

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium

{maurice, henkv, marcd}@cs.kuleuven.ac.be,

² Centre for Business Mathematics and Informatics

Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education, South Africa

BWIDADW@puknet.puk.ac.za

Abstract. In solving a query, the SLD proof procedure for definite programs sometimes searches an infinite space for a non existing solution. For example, querying a planner for an unreachable goal state. Such programs motivate the development of methods to prove the absence of a solution. Considering the definite program and the query $\leftarrow Q$ as clauses of a first order theory, one can apply model generators which search for a finite interpretation in which the program clauses as well as the clause **false** $\leftarrow Q$ are true. This paper develops a new approach which exploits the fact that all clauses are definite. It is based on a goal directed abductive search in the space of finite pre-interpretations for a pre-interpretation such that Q is false in the least model of the program based on it. Several methods for efficiently searching the space of pre-interpretations are presented. Experimental results confirm that our approach find solutions with less search than with the use of a first order model generator.

Keywords: Logic Programming, Termination, Pre-interpretation, Abduction, Tabulation, Constraint Logic Programming.

1 Introduction

For many definite programs there exist queries for which the SLD-tree (under the left-to-right computation rule) is infinite. In some cases the infinite tree contains no solution. This paper is about proving the latter efficiently. Our original motivation stems from the world of planning. Typically, a planner searches an infinite space of candidate plans for a plan satisfying all requirements. It is useful to have a second process which searches for a proof that not all requirements can be met; if found, the first process can be stopped (and the other way around if a plan is found). Another application is in proving that a program satisfies certain integrity constraints. For example, a program defining even and odd numbers

should satisfy the integrity constraint that no number is both even and odd. This can be proven by showing that the query $\leftarrow \text{even}(X), \text{odd}(X)$ fails.

Failure of a query $\leftarrow Q$ can be proven by showing that Q is not a logical consequence of the program, in other words by constructing an interpretation in which the program clauses are true (i.e. which is a model of the program) and in which Q is false (or alternatively, the clause $\text{false} \leftarrow Q$ is true). First order model generators [27,28,35,24] can be used for this task. They search for an interpretation over a finite domain such that all clauses of a given set evaluate to true.

This paper develops an alternative approach which exploits the fact that definite programs have least models. If Q is false in some model based on a pre-interpretation, then it is also false in the least model based on that pre-interpretation. Hence, it should be better to search in the space of pre-interpretations for a pre-interpretation such that Q is false in the least model based on it than to search in the larger space of interpretations for an interpretation such that the program clauses are true and Q is false.

While this paper is one of the first to address the problem of proving that an SLD-tree contains no solutions, the related problem, proving that the SLD-tree is finite, has received a lot of attention in the literature on termination analysis. See [13] for a survey. As argued above, useful programs exist for which the SLD-tree is not finite.

The problems caused by infinite branches in proof trees have also been addressed in work on loop checking [2,3,26]. The idea is to monitor the execution and to try to prune infinitely failing branches. However, methods have to choose between pruning too much (causing incompleteness of the proof procedure) and preserving completeness but missing some infinite branches. Proof procedures with tabling such as XSB [25] are perhaps a better alternative to a completeness preserving procedure equipped with loop checking. They avoid the overhead of monitoring the execution while using a different proof procedure which, compared to SLD, reduces the number of infinite branches. In particular, they always terminate for DATALOG programs.

The work in [4] takes a different approach. A logic program is represented as a set of equivalence preserving rewrite rules. One of the effects of the “simplification inference rule” is to eliminate certain infinite derivations. We have not studied this approach in detail. We suspect its power is comparable to that of conjunctive partial deduction [22,14] which is discussed in Section 5.

Section 2 recalls the basics about pre-interpretations and introduces a trivial example. Section 3, explains how a pre-interpretation can be described by a number of facts, how a program can be abstracted as a DATALOG program, and how the least model based on that pre-interpretation can be queried by evaluating the abstracted query on the DATALOG program. Section 4 develops two procedures for proving failure. The first one combines abduction with tabulation and failure analysis. The second one combines constraints with tabulation and develops two alternatives for the constraint solving. The first alternative uses abduction and failure analysis in the constraint checking. The second one

translates the constraints into finite domain constraints and uses a finite domain solver for the constraint checking. Section 5 discusses alternative approaches: the use of model generators for first order logic [27,28,35,24], of type analysis [19,10] (a query fails if its inferred type is empty) and of program specialisation [22,14] (the query fails if the program—for the given query— can be specialised into the empty program). In section 6, the different approaches are compared. Finally, in section 7, we draw some conclusions. We assume some familiarity with the basics of tabulation, e.g. [31,25,33].

Some of the authors of the current paper participated in a preliminary investigation of the topic [15]. The current paper is an extension of the work described in [9].

2 Preliminaries

A pre-interpretation J of a program P consists of a domain $D = \{d_1, \dots, d_m\}$ and, for every functor f/n a mapping f_J from D^n to D . An interpretation I based on a pre-interpretation J extends J with a mapping p_I from D^n to $\{true, false\}$ for every predicate p/n in P . Extending the language of the program P with the domain D , an interpretation can be identified with the set of atoms $p(d_1, \dots, d_n)$ for which $p_I(d_1, \dots, d_n)$ is mapped to *true*.

An interpretation I is a model of a program P iff all clauses of P are true under the interpretation I . For every pre-interpretation J , a definite program has a model I based on J (map $p_I(d_1, \dots, d_n)$ to *true* for all predicates and all domain elements). The intersection of a set of models based on J is also a model based on J , hence there is a unique least model based on J . We denote this model by $LM_J(P)$. As a consequence, if an existentially quantified conjunction $\exists \bar{X} L_1 \wedge \dots \wedge L_n$ (a query) is false in a model based on a pre-interpretation J then it is also false in $LM_J(P)$. So, to check whether some pre-interpretation J can be the basis of a model in which an existentially quantified conjunction is false, it suffices to evaluate the conjunction in $LM_J(P)$. This can be summarised in the following proposition:

Proposition 1. *Given a pre-interpretation J , there exists an interpretation I based on J which is a model of $P \cup \{\text{false} \leftarrow Q\}$ iff $LM_J(P) \models \text{false} \leftarrow Q$.*

Example 1. Even/odd

`even(0) ←`

`even(s(X)) ← odd(X).`

`odd(s(X)) ← even(X).`

$D = \{\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O}\}$

$0_J = \mathcal{E}, p_s(\mathcal{E}) = \mathcal{O}, p_s(\mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{E}$

The least model is $\{even(\mathcal{E}), odd(\mathcal{O})\}$. The query `← even(X), odd(X)` fails because $\exists X even(X) \wedge odd(X)$ is false in this model. Executing the program with SLD or with a tabulating procedure (e.g. XSB [25]) results in infinite failure. All methods discussed in Section 5 can handle this problem.

A variable assignment σ is a mapping from variables to domain elements. Given a pre-interpretation J , this mapping can be extended in a term assignment (variables are assigned according to σ , functors according to J). $J_\sigma(t)$ denotes the term assignment of t under the pre-interpretation J and variable assignment σ . Given an interpretation I , the mapping can be further extended to a truth assignment. $I_\sigma(F)$ gives the truth value of the formula F under the interpretation I (based on a pre-interpretation J) and the variable assignment σ .

3 Proof procedures

In [12], Codish and Demoen developed so called abstract compilation to perform groundness analysis of logic programs. Applying a transformation on the original program, they obtain an abstracted program. Groundness is then derived from a least model of the abstracted program. In later work [11], they used the same technique to perform other analyses. Boulanger and coauthors [7,6] explored the use of pre-interpretations to approximate the s-semantics [5] of programs and to derive properties from this approximation. In [18], the approach of Codish and Demoen is generalised and presented as defining a pre-interpretation and computing the least model of the abstracted program; several applications are presented. It became clear that abstract compilation is a technique allowing the efficient computation of a program's least model based on a pre-interpretation.

Abstract compilation consists of eliminating non variable terms from clauses. A term $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ is replaced by a fresh variable X and a call $p_f(t_1, \dots, t_n, X)$ is added to the body of the clause. This is repeated until all non variable terms have disappeared from the program clauses. Note that this transformation is independent from the particular pre-interpretation. The abstract program is completed with the pre-interpretation J in relational form: the set of facts $\{p_f(d_1, \dots, d_n, d) \leftarrow |f_J(d_1, \dots, d_n) = d\}$. Each fact represents a *component* of the pre-interpretation. With J a pre-interpretation, P_J^a denotes its relational form.

Example 2. Applying abstract compilation on the program and pre-interpretation of Example 1, we obtain:

```

even(X) ← p0(X)
even(Y) ← ps(X, Y), odd(X).
odd(Y) ← ps(X, Y), even(X).
p0(E) ←
ps(E, O) ←
ps(O, E) ←

```

The clauses together with the facts of the pre-interpretation form a DATA-LOG program. The least model is $\{p_0(E), p_s(E, O), p_s(O, E), even(E), odd(O)\}$. The formula $\exists X even(X) \wedge odd(X)$ is false in this model. While the query $\leftarrow even(X), odd(X)$ is nonterminating under SLD, it fails finitely under well known proof procedures such as bottom-up evaluation after magic-set transformation or top-down methods enriched with tabulation such as OLDT [31] and XSB [25].

In what follows, we give some results formalising the relationship between a program and its abstraction. First, we introduce some notational conventions. With Cl a clause, Cl^a denotes its abstraction; with P a set of clauses (a program), P^a denotes its abstraction. J^a is the Herbrand pre-interpretation of $P^a \cup P_J^a$. Remark that J^a has the same domain as J as the domain elements are the only functors in $P^a \cup P_J^a$. I_J denotes the interpretation which is the least Herbrand model of P_J^a . Finally, I^a is the interpretation of $P^a \cup P_J^a$ corresponding to the interpretation I when $I^a = I \cup I_J$.

Theorem 1. *Let I be an interpretation of P based on pre-interpretation J and I^a the corresponding interpretation of $P^a \cup P_J^a$. The interpretation I is a model of $P \cup \{\text{false} \leftarrow Q\}$ iff I^a is a model of $P^a \cup P_J^a \cup \{\text{false} \leftarrow Q^a\}$.*

Proof.

Consider a slightly different clause transformation which replaces a term $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ by a fresh variable X and adds the equality $f(t_1, \dots, t_n) = X$ to the body of the clause. Repeat this transformation until all non variable terms are eliminated from argument positions in program predicates and from argument positions in terms of the equalities. The difference between the resulting clause Cl' and the abstracted clause Cl^a is that Cl' has an equality $f(X_1, \dots, X_n) = X$ where Cl^a has a call $p_f(X_1, \dots, X_n, X)$.

This new transformation is equivalency preserving hence $I \models Cl$ iff $I \models Cl'$.

Given a variable assignment σ , $I_\sigma(f(X_1, \dots, X_n) = X)$ is true iff $\sigma(X) = f_J(\sigma(X_1), \dots, \sigma(X_n))$. We also have that $I_\sigma^a(p_f(X_1, \dots, X_n, X))$ is true iff $\sigma(X) = f_J(\sigma(X_1), \dots, \sigma(X_n))$. Hence, $I_\sigma(f(X_1, \dots, X_n) = X) = I_\sigma^a(p_f(X_1, \dots, X_n, X))$. Also for program predicates, we have $I_\sigma(p(X_1, \dots, X_n)) = I_\sigma^a(p(X_1, \dots, X_n))$, hence $I \models Cl'$ iff $I^a \models Cl^a$. As this holds for all clauses and for the query, the theorem follows. $\square$

Abstract compilation is a simple variant of more general transformation to substitute predicate symbols by function symbols which is well known in logic, e.g. [17].

Corollary 1. *Given a sound and complete proof procedure, the query $\leftarrow Q^a$ fails for the program $P^a \cup P_J^a$ iff there exists an interpretation I based on J such that $I(Q)$ is false.*

Proof

By Prop. 1, $I(Q)$ is false iff $LM_J(P) \models \text{false} \leftarrow Q$.

By Theorem 1, $LM_J(P) \models \text{false} \leftarrow Q$ iff $LM_J(P^a) \cup I_J \models \text{false} \leftarrow Q^a$.

$LM_J(P^a) \cup I_J$ is the least Herbrand model of $P^a \cup P_J^a$, hence, given a sound and complete proof procedure, $\leftarrow Q^a$ fails iff $LM_J(P^a) \cup I_J \models \text{false} \leftarrow Q^a$ iff $I(Q)$ is false. $\square$

4 The search for the right pre-interpretation

To prove failure, the approach is to select a domain and a pre-interpretation and to show finite failure when executing the abstracted query with the abstracted

program. A straightforward way consists of selecting a domain and trying all pre-interpretations until one is found for which the query fails. If none exists, one can try again with a larger domain. However, for programs with a substantial number of function symbols and constants, this quickly results in a very large search space. Indeed, with a n -element domain, an m -ary functor has $n^{(n^m)}$ possible pre-interpretations.

Hence better is to consider P_f^a , the part defining the pre-interpretation, as unknown and the use a procedure which can guess the missing predicate definitions. Abduction [21] is such a mechanism. In an abductive setting, given is a logic program P defining a subset D of its predicates, a set T of integrity constraints in classical logic and some query Q . Abduction searches a definition Δ of the open, abducible predicates, i.e. those not defined by P such that $P \cup \Delta \models Q$ and $P \cup \Delta \models T$. For our problem, the defined predicates are those defined by P^a (the set of abstracted clauses), the abducibles are $p_f/n + 1$, the query is the abstracted query $\leftarrow \text{not } Q^a$ (we want a solution for which the query fails) and the integrity constraints are axioms restricting $p_f/n + 1$ to correspond to a pre-interpretation which is a total function, i.e. $\forall X_1 \dots X_n \exists! Y. p_f(X_1, \dots, X_n, Y)$. Hence the problem is to find a Δ such that $P^a \cup \Delta \models \text{false} \leftarrow Q$ and satisfies the integrity constraints.

In a first experiment, we have used the general purpose abductive procedure SLDNFA [16] to solve the problem. A first problem that we met was that SLDNFA looped on the abstract program due to non-acyclic recursion in it. To overcome this problem, the clauses defining the recursive predicates were transformed into integrity constraints. Some initial experiments showed the feasibility, but also the need for a dedicated procedure which allows to experiment with different control strategies.

Abduction is complex in the general case due to the presence of variables in abductive calls and the interaction with negation as failure. We are only concerned with definite programs, that simplifies substantially the design of a dedicated procedure. Moreover, we know that the pre-interpretation of a functor f/n is a total function from D^n to D . Hence, a complete pre-interpretation has exactly one fact $p_f(d_1, \dots, d_n, d) \leftarrow$ for every tuple $\langle d_1, \dots, d_n \rangle$ of domain elements and d is also a domain element. As a consequence, our abductive procedure has only to “guess” among the domain elements for the value of d . So it becomes fairly simple to ensure correctness and completeness. A call $p_f(t_1, \dots, t_n, t)$ needs to be resolved with all the facts $p_f(d_1, \dots, d_n, d)$ such that $\langle d_1, \dots, d_n \rangle$ unifies with $\langle t_1, \dots, t_n \rangle$. If some of these facts do not yet exist, they have to be abducted. To obtain an exhaustive search over all candidate abductive solutions, one has only to take care that all domain elements are in turn considered as candidate values for d .

To overcome the problem of looping, our dedicated procedure makes use of tabulation. Tabulation [31,25,33] avoids non termination in the case of DAT-ALOG programs. As we only consider definite programs, the concept is fairly simple. When a call $p(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ to a tabled predicate is selected in a goal, the goal is suspended and the query $\leftarrow p(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ is evaluated in isola-

tion of its goal. Eventually, evaluation of this new query leads to computed answer substitutions $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots$. For each of these answers σ_i , an answer lemma $p(t_1, \dots, t_n)\sigma_i \leftarrow$ is stored (if not the renaming of a previous answer) in the table associated with the call $p(t_1, \dots, t_n)$. The suspended goal is reactivated for each answer lemma and a resolution step is performed, using the answer lemma as program clause. If in another goal the atom $p(s_1, \dots, s_n)$ is selected and the atom happens to be a renaming of $p(t_1, \dots, t_n)$, then no separate query for $\leftarrow p(s_1, \dots, s_n)$ is launched. The goal is simply suspended and is reactivated for each answer lemma stored in the table associated with the query $\leftarrow p(t_1, \dots, t_n)$.

As the abstract program has no functors apart from the 0-arity domain elements, only a finite number of distinct calls can occur. Also, for each call, only a finite number of distinct answers can occur, hence termination is ensured.

We prefer top-down evaluation with tabulation above bottom-up evaluation because top-down is goal directed. Our procedures use heuristics; these try to find those refutations which are short and use as few different components of the pre-interpretation as possible first. We find it more convenient to design such heuristics in the context of a top-down procedure.

As a final remark, it is well possible that not all components of a pre-interpretation are needed to evaluate a particular abstract query. In such case, our dedicated procedure will not abduce the complete pre-interpretation. For the not abduced facts $p_f(d_1, \dots, d_n, d) \leftarrow$, any value d can be chosen. Adding them will neither modify the proof structure nor the outcome of the query evaluation.

4.1 An abductive approach

When experimenting with a dedicated abductive procedure, an early observation concerned the tabulation mechanism. Typically, several table entries were created for the same predicate. Frequently, a “final” call occurred with a call pattern where all arguments are free variables. This final call subsumed all previous ones. Hence it is more efficient, when a call $p(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ occurs to a tabled predicate, to compute once and for all the answers to the most general query $\leftarrow p(X_1, \dots, X_n)$. Unification of the call $p(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ with the answer lemmas then selects the answers to the call which occurred. We also observed that it was preferable to table all program predicates, whether recursive or not. Again the sum of the costs of evaluating each separate call was larger than evaluating once the most general call. We adopted these strategies in all our systematic experiments and it is hard wired in the description of the procedure below.

We need some notational conventions to describe the procedure. The state of the computation is represented as a set of clauses. The symbol **C1** represents a clause and the symbol **C1s** represents a set of clauses. Clauses that are a renaming of each other are considered equal. **As** and **Bs** represent sequences of atoms. A clause is represented as $H \leftarrow As$ in which the head **H** is an atom (or **false**). **s** and **t** ($\bar{s}$ and $\bar{t}$) denote a term (a vector of terms); **d** ($\bar{d}$) denotes a domain element (a vector of domain elements).

The procedure (Fig. 1) is described as a set of inference rules which extend the state with new clauses. Given a query $\leftarrow \text{As}$, the initial state of the derivation is represented as $\{\text{false} \leftarrow \text{As}\}$. p/n refers to a predicate of the original program; calls to such predicates are tabled. The tabulation has an implicit representation: a predicate is tabled when the clauses defining it occur in the state; answer lemmas for p/n occur in the state as facts $\text{p}(\bar{s}) \leftarrow$ (when all calls in the body of a clause defining p/n are solved, a fact is left). $\text{abduce}_f(\bar{t})$ is the notation we use for a call to an abducible predicate $\text{p}_f(\bar{t})$ of the pre-interpretation. These calls are not tabled. A clause $\text{H} \leftarrow \text{Lookup}(\text{p}(\bar{t})), \text{As}$ is a suspended clause, waiting for answers of the call $\text{p}(\bar{t})$. For simplicity of representation we assume the computation rule always select the leftmost atom in the body of a clause.

Nr	State	Condition	New State
1a	$\{\text{H} \leftarrow \text{p}(\bar{t}), \text{As}\} \cup \text{Cls}$	$\text{not_tabled}(\text{p})$	$\{\text{H} \leftarrow \text{Lookup}(\text{p}(\bar{t})), \text{As}\} \cup \{\text{Cl} \mid \text{Cl is a clause defining p}\} \cup \text{Cls}$
1b	$\{\text{H} \leftarrow \text{p}(\bar{t}), \text{As}\} \cup \text{Cls}$	$\text{tabled}(\text{p})$	$\{\text{H} \leftarrow \text{Lookup}(\text{p}(\bar{t})), \text{As}\} \cup \text{Cls}$
2	Cls which contains $\text{p}(\bar{s}) \leftarrow$ and $\text{H} \leftarrow \text{Lookup}(\text{p}(\bar{t})), \text{As}$	$\text{unify}(\bar{s}, \bar{t})$	$\{(\text{H} \leftarrow \text{As})\text{mgu}(\bar{t}, \bar{s})\} \cup \text{Cls}$
3	Cls which contains $\text{abduce}_f(\bar{d}) \leftarrow$ and $\text{H} \leftarrow \text{abduce}_f(\bar{t}), \text{As}$	$\text{unify}(\bar{d}, \bar{t})$	$\{(\text{H} \leftarrow \text{As})\text{mgu}(\bar{t}, \bar{d})\} \cup \text{Cls}$
4	Cls which contains $\text{H} \leftarrow \text{abduce}_f(\bar{t}, t), \text{As}$	$\exists \bar{d}: (\text{unify}(\bar{t}, \bar{d}) \text{ and } \forall d: \text{abduce}_f(\bar{d}, d) \leftarrow \notin \text{Cls})$	$\{\text{abduce}_f(\bar{d}, d) \leftarrow\} \cup \text{Cls}$ where d is a domain element
5	Cls	$\text{false} \leftarrow \in \text{Cls}$	failure

Fig. 1. Inference rules of abductive procedure.

We assume a fixed number of domain elements. Rules 1 to 3 describe the execution under tabling. Given a complete pre-interpretation, these rules will derive all consequences. Rule 1 handles a call to a tabled predicate. The clauses defining it are added to the state when it is the first call to the predicate (1a). Whether the first call or not, the clause is suspended (the selected call is wrapped inside `Lookup`). Rule 2 uses an answer lemma to derive a new clause from a suspended one and rule 3 uses a fact from the pre-interpretation to derive a new clause (here and elsewhere, the necessary renaming is omitted to simplify the presentation). Rule 4 performs abduction on demand: if rule 3 needs a component of the pre-interpretation which is not yet defined, then rule 4 adds such a component to the state. The value assigned to the component is chosen from the domain. This rule is non-deterministic; it derives one new state for each domain element. Rule 5 detects that the query has a solution, i.e. that the (partial) pre-interpretation

being considered does not meet the requirement. Hence it replaces the state by the final state **failure**.

A solution is found when a final state is reached that is different from failure, (no new clauses can be derived). Although the pre-interpretation can still be partial, any extension to a complete pre-interpretation is the basis for a model of the program in which the query fails.

Correctness and termination. Assuming the pre-interpretation (the set of facts $\text{abduce}_f(\bar{d})$) is complete, rules 2 and 3 perform unit resolution on a set of clauses consisting of the query and the program clauses. Rule 1 is a heuristic which delays resolution steps on program clauses until it is certain they can contribute in the derivation of the empty clause from the query. Unit resolution is known to be a correct and complete proof procedure for definite clauses; moreover, as the Herbrand universe of the program is the finite domain of the pre-interpretation, only a finite number of clauses can be derived and termination is ensured (for a fixed pre-interpretation).

However, the computation start with an empty pre-interpretation. The role of rule 4 is to create a component of the pre-interpretation as soon as rule 3 can make use of it. This does not affect correctness. As rule 4 can only choose among a finite number of domain elements, and can only be applied a finite number of times in a particular derivation, overall termination remains ensured. Rule 5 plays the role of a filter, it stops the derivation when it detects that the query has a solution.

Control. In our implementation, the choice offered by rule 4 is implemented through enumeration and backtracking. When applying rule 4, a choice point is created which keeps track of the untried domain elements. When rule 5 is activated, it triggers backtracking to the last choice point where the next value is tried. If none, backtracking continues to the previous choice point. The overall computation fails as soon as backtracking occurs and no alternative is left in any choice point.

The order in which rules are applied can have a big impact on the size of the search space. Obviously, rule 5, which triggers backtracking should be activated as soon as a clause (**false** $\leftarrow$) is inferred. Also, the creation of a new choice point should be delayed as long as possible, i.e. one should not create another choice point if the already abducted facts allow to infer the clause (**false** $\leftarrow$). A simple implementation almost realising this strategy selects the leftmost literal in a clause body and applies the applicable rule, delaying the processing of the clause if the selected literal is an abducible for which not all instances are already abducted. Once no other rules are applicable, rule 4 is applied on one of the delayed clauses. Experiments showed that more complex strategies —causing more meta-interpretation overhead— which do not necessarily select the leftmost literal tend to perform better. In processing new clauses, the system reported in section 6 has a preference for applying a look-up step (rule 2). If none is applicable it attempts to apply rule 3 on an abducible literal for which all matching components of the pre-interpretation are defined (so that all resolvents can be

computed at once and the original clause can be removed). If the clause has no such abducible, it is delayed. Once all clauses are delayed, it gives preference to the application of rule 1 on a clause with only calls to program predicates. If no such clause is delayed, rule 4 is applied on a delayed clause. A heuristic selects the delayed clause containing the abducible which needs the least number of yet to be abducted instances to allow for the application of rule 3 and abduces those instances.

4.2 A constraint approach

We use a more compact notation in this section. We write $\text{abduce}(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}), \mathbf{X})$ instead of $\text{abduce}_a(\mathbf{Y}), \text{abduce}_f(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X})$. With this notation, the abstraction of an atom $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}))$ becomes $\text{abduce}(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}), \mathbf{X}), \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{X})$.

A weakness of the abductive approach can be illustrated with the following example: assume that the pre-interpretation of a functor $\mathbf{f}/1$ has already been abducted as $\text{abduce}(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d1}), \mathbf{d1})$ and $\text{abduce}(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{d2}), \mathbf{d2})$ and that a clause $\text{false} \leftarrow \text{abduce}(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{a}))), \mathbf{X}), \text{abduce}(\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{a}))), \mathbf{X}$ is derived. The pre-interpretation of $\mathbf{f}/1$ is such that for all domain elements d , $f(d) = d$, hence, whatever the pre-interpretation for $\mathbf{a}/0$, $\mathbf{h}/1$, and $\mathbf{g}/1$, $\text{false} \leftarrow$ will be derived. The abductive system will abduce pre-interpretations for $\mathbf{a}/0$, $\mathbf{h}/1$, and $\mathbf{g}/1$, and will then discover the failure. It will exhaustively enumerate all pre-interpretations for $\mathbf{a}/0$, $\mathbf{h}/1$, and $\mathbf{g}/1$ before backtracking to the pre-interpretation of $\mathbf{f}/1$.

A constraint based approach can to a large extent avoid such problems. We consider the abducibles as constraints and use a special purpose constraint solver which checks the existence of a pre-interpretation which satisfies all constraints. In the above example, if the pre-interpretation of $\mathbf{f}/1$ is constrained to the shown one and the clause $\text{false} \leftarrow \text{abduce}(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{a}))), \mathbf{X}), \text{abduce}(\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{a}))), \mathbf{X}$ is derived, then the solver detects the inconsistency and triggers backtracking.

This approach makes it necessary to reformulate our abductive system. The major difference is with respect to the tabulation. The answers to a tabled predicate are no more simple facts but constrained facts (of the form $\mathbf{p}(\overline{\mathbf{X}}) \leftarrow \text{abduce}(\dots), \dots, \text{abduce}(\dots)$). A problem is that one can have an infinite number of syntactically different answers. However, with a finite domain and a fixed pre-interpretation, the set of answers (its model) is finite. So it must be possible to add constraints which enforce the finiteness. Before presenting the formal system, we illustrate the main ideas with the *even/odd* example.

Example 3. Even/odd

The program is as follows:

```
even(X) ← abduce(0, X).
even(Y) ← abduce(s(X), Y), odd(X).
odd(Y)  ← abduce(s(X), Y), even(X).
```

The execution is shown in Fig. 2. We represent the state of the derivation by three components, the set of clauses, the set of answers and the constraint store which holds the set of constraints (as before, the component with the fixed

abstract program is left out). $\emptyset$ stands for the empty set. *Lookup* is abbreviated as *L*, and *false*, *abduce*, *even* and *odd* respectively as *f*, *ab*, *e* and *o*. Finally, *sb* is the abbreviation of *subsumed*.

0. In the initial state the only clause is the query. The leftmost atom is selected; the two clauses defining **even/1** are added to the set of clauses and the original clause suspends, waiting for answers from **even/1**.
1. The second clause, a constrained fact, is selected. A choice point is created. The first alternative adds the constraint **subsumed(even(X) $\leftarrow$ abduce(0,X), $\emptyset$)** to the constraint store in an attempt to have the new fact subsumed by the existing ones. Whatever the pre-interpretation, **abduce(0,d)** is true for some domain element *d* and **even(d)** is an answer which is not subsumed by previous answers as there are none. Hence the constraint is false and the second and last alternative is taken: the fact is added to the set of answers and the constraint **not(subsumed(even(X) $\leftarrow$ abduce(0,X), $\emptyset$))** is added to the store. The constraint is equivalent to true, hence the store remains empty.
2. The call **odd(X)** is selected in the second clause; the clause defining **odd/1** is added. In the (omitted) new state, this clause is chosen and its atom **even(X)** is selected. As **even/1** has been called before, no new clauses are added.
4. This step and the next one perform resolution between the answer and suspended first and last clause. In one of the new clauses, **abduce(s(X),Y)**, **abduce(0,X)** is abbreviated as **abduce(s(0),Y)**.
6. One step selects the atom **odd(X)** in the second clause and suspends the clause. Another step selects the last clause which is a constrained answer. We have a choice point; as there are no previous answers for **odd/1**, the subsumption constraint leads again to an inconsistent store and the not-subsumption constraint is again equivalent to true. Hence, the net effect is that the clause is added to the answers.
8. The next two steps perform resolution between the new answer and the second and third clause, resulting in two new clauses.
10. The third clause is a constraint, consistent with the store, and is added to it. The constraint says that 0 and **s(0)** have to be different under the pre-interpretation.
11. The fourth clause is an answer for **even/1**. A choice point is created. The first alternative creates the constraint that the new answer is subsumed by the existing answers: **subsumed(even(Y) $\leftarrow$ abduce(s(s(0)),Y), {even(X) $\leftarrow$ abduce(0,X)})**. It is consistent with the constraint store (e.g. with $p_0 = \mathcal{E}$ $p_s(\mathcal{E}) = \mathcal{O}$ $p_s(\mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{E}$, **subsumed(even($\mathcal{E}$), {even($\mathcal{E}$)})** is true), hence it is added to it and the answer clause is dropped. The new constraint says that 0 and **s(s(0))** have to be equal under the pre-interpretation.
12. No new clauses can be derived. The store is consistent, hence there exists a pre-interpretation satisfying it (e.g. **abduce(0,d1)**, **abduce(s(d1),d2)** and **abduce(s(d2),d1)**) and **$\leftarrow$ even(X), odd(X)** is false in the least model based on a pre-interpretation consistent with the constraint store.

	Clauses	Answers	Constraint Store
0	$f \leftarrow e(X), o(X)$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$
1	$f \leftarrow L(e(X)), o(X)$ $e(X) \leftarrow ab(0, X)$ $e(Y) \leftarrow ab(s(X), Y), o(X)$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$
2	$f \leftarrow L(e(X)), o(X)$ $e(Y) \leftarrow ab(s(X), Y), o(X)$	$e(X) \leftarrow ab(0, X)$	$\emptyset$
4	$f \leftarrow L(e(X)), o(X)$ $e(Y) \leftarrow ab(s(X), Y), L(o(X))$ $o(Y) \leftarrow ab(s(X), Y), L(e(X))$	$e(X) \leftarrow ab(0, X)$	$\emptyset$
6	$f \leftarrow L(e(X)), o(X)$ $f \leftarrow ab(0, X), o(X)$ $e(Y) \leftarrow ab(s(X), Y), L(o(X))$ $o(Y) \leftarrow ab(s(X), Y), L(e(X))$ $o(Y) \leftarrow ab(s(0), Y)$	$e(X) \leftarrow ab(0, X)$	$\emptyset$
8	$f \leftarrow L(e(X)), o(X)$ $f \leftarrow ab(0, X), L(o(X))$ $e(Y) \leftarrow ab(s(X), Y), L(o(X))$ $o(Y) \leftarrow ab(s(X), Y), L(e(X))$	$e(X) \leftarrow ab(0, X)$ $o(Y) \leftarrow ab(s(0), Y)$	$\emptyset$
10	$f \leftarrow L(e(X)), o(X)$ $f \leftarrow ab(0, X), L(o(X))$ $f \leftarrow ab(0, X), ab(s(0), X)$ $e(Y) \leftarrow ab(s(X), Y), L(o(X))$ $e(Y) \leftarrow ab(s(s(0))), Y$ $o(Y) \leftarrow ab(s(X), Y), L(e(X))$	$e(X) \leftarrow ab(0, X)$ $o(Y) \leftarrow ab(s(0), Y)$	$\emptyset$
11	$f \leftarrow L(e(X)), o(X)$ $f \leftarrow ab(0, X), L(o(X))$ $e(Y) \leftarrow ab(s(X), Y), L(o(X))$ $e(Y) \leftarrow ab(s(s(0))), Y,$ $o(Y) \leftarrow ab(s(X), Y), L(e(X))$	$e(X) \leftarrow ab(0, X)$ $o(Y) \leftarrow ab(s(0), Y),$	$f \leftarrow ab(0, X), ab(s(0), X)$
12	$f \leftarrow L(e(X)), o(X)$ $f \leftarrow ab(0, X), L(o(X))$ $e(Y) \leftarrow ab(s(X), Y), L(o(X))$ $o(Y) \leftarrow ab(s(X), Y), L(e(X))$	$e(X) \leftarrow ab(0, X)$ $o(Y) \leftarrow ab(s(0), Y)$	$f \leftarrow ab(0, X), ab(s(0), X)$ $sb(e(Y) \leftarrow ab(s(s(0))), Y),$ $\{e(X) \leftarrow ab(0, X)\}$

Fig. 2. Constraint based execution for even-odd program.

The inference rules of the constraint procedure are shown in Fig. 3. A state, consisting of clauses, answers and a constraint store is represented as $\text{Cls} \diamond \text{Answ} \diamond \text{Store}$. The symbols As and Bs stand for any sequence of atoms, while Abds stands for a sequence consisting solely of abduce atoms. Store stands for a conjunction (set) of constraints, Answ for a set of answers (constrained facts) and Answ_p for the subset of answers about predicate p . The initial state is given by $\text{false} \leftarrow \text{As} \diamond \emptyset \diamond \emptyset$ where $\leftarrow \text{As}$ is the query. $\text{subs}(x, y)$ is an abbreviation for $\text{subsumed}(x, y)$ and $\text{not_subs}(x, y)$ for $\text{not}(\text{subsumed}(x, y))$; $\text{inconst}(x)$ is an abbreviation for $\text{inconsistent}(x)$. Remember that arguments of program predicates of the abstracted program are always variables.

Nr	State	Condition	New State
1a	$\{\text{H} \leftarrow \text{p}(\vec{t}), \text{As}\} \cup \text{Cls}$ $\diamond \text{Answ} \diamond \text{Store}$	$\text{not_tabled}(\text{p})$	$\{\text{H} \leftarrow \text{Lookup}(\text{p}(\vec{t})), \text{As}\} \cup \text{Cls}$ $\cup \{\text{Cl} \mid \text{Cl is a clause defining p}\}$ $\diamond \text{Answ} \diamond \text{Store}$
1b	$\{\text{H} \leftarrow \text{p}(\vec{t}), \text{As}\} \cup \text{Cls}$ $\diamond \text{Answ} \diamond \text{Store}$	$\text{tabled}(\text{p})$	$\{\text{H} \leftarrow \text{Lookup}(\text{p}(\vec{t})), \text{As}\} \cup \text{Cls}$ $\diamond \text{Answ} \diamond \text{Store}$
2	$\text{Cls} \diamond \text{Answ} \diamond \text{Store}$ $\text{p}(\vec{s}) \leftarrow \text{Abds} \in \text{Answ}$ $\text{H} \leftarrow \text{Lookup}(\text{p}(\vec{t})), \text{As} \in \text{Cls}$	$\text{unify}(\vec{s}, \vec{t})$	$\{(\text{H} \leftarrow \text{Abds}, \text{As})\text{mgu}(\vec{t}, \vec{s})\} \cup \text{Cls}$ $\diamond \text{Answ} \diamond \text{Store}$
3	$\{\text{false} \leftarrow \text{Abds}\} \cup \text{Cls}$ $\diamond \text{Answ} \diamond \text{Store}$		$\text{Cls} \diamond \text{Answ}$ $\diamond \{\text{false} \leftarrow \text{Abds}\} \cup \text{Store}$
4	$\text{Cls} \diamond \text{Answ} \diamond \text{Store}$	$\text{inconst}(\text{Store})$	failure
5a	$\{\text{p}(\vec{X}) \leftarrow \text{Abds}\} \cup \text{Cls}$ $\diamond \text{Answ} \diamond \text{Store}$		$\text{Cls} \diamond \text{Answ} \diamond$ $\{\text{subs}(\text{p}(\vec{X}) \leftarrow \text{Abds}, \text{Answ}_p)\}$ $\cup \text{Store}$
5b	$\{\text{p}(\vec{X}) \leftarrow \text{Abds}\} \cup \text{Cls}$ $\diamond \text{Answ} \diamond \text{Store}$		$\text{Cls} \diamond \{\text{p}(\vec{X}) \leftarrow \text{Abds}\} \cup \text{Answ} \diamond$ $\{\text{not_subs}(\text{p}(\vec{X}) \leftarrow \text{Abds}, \text{Answ}_p)\}$ $\cup \text{Store}$

Fig. 3. Inference rules of constraint procedure.

Rules 1a, 1b and 2 are as before. Rule 3 adds a new constraint to the constraint store. Rule 4 stops the derivation with failure when the store is inconsistent. Rule 5 processes a new answer lemma. It is a non deterministic rule. 5a handles the alternative where it is enforced that the new answer lemma is subsumed by the existing answers (Answ_p). The lemma is deleted and the subsumption constraint is added to the store. 5b handles the case where it is enforced that the answer is not subsumed by the previous one. It is added to the answers and the negation of the subsumption constraint is added to the store.

Correctness and termination. This proof procedure preserves the properties about correctness and completeness of the abductive one. In terms of the inferences it makes, the difference is that it uses constrained facts $\{\text{p}(\vec{X}) \leftarrow \text{Abds}\}$

instead of facts $p(\bar{t})$ and that it delegates the processing of the calls to the abducibles to the constraint solver. Hence the inferences it makes are correct and completeness is preserved. Termination remains ensured if the number of answers for each program predicate remains finite and consistency checking is terminating. A `not(subsumed(...))` constraint stating that the new answer is not subsumed by the previous ones is added to the constraint store each time that a new answer is added to the answer set. With n the size of the domain, the number of distinct atoms in the model of a m -ary predicate is limited to m^n . Hence, if more than m^n answers are added for the same predicate, an inconsistent store will be reached. The consistency check has to verify that a pre-interpretation exists which satisfies all constraints. As the number of different pre-interpretations is finite and the number of constraints is finite, its termination can be ensured.

Control and consistency checking. The best way to handle the choice offered by rule 5 is through enumeration and backtracking where preference is given to rule 5a as it leads to the smallest answer set, hence to the shortest derivation.

In the abductive algorithm the choice implies a commitment for a particular component of the pre-interpretation. In this algorithm the choice does not imply such a direct commitment. However, adding a non redundant constraint reduces the number of pre-interpretations that satisfy all constraints; it is a kind of indirect commitment.

The solver which has to verify the consistency plays a crucial role. We have explored two alternatives. The first approach (abductive solver) abduces the components of the pre-interpretation as needed during the verification of the constraints. Backtracking is triggered when a constraint is violated. (This is similar to the strategy in the abductive algorithm, but at the level of the constraint checking.) Note that the constraint checking can be incremental; each time a new constraint is added, the search starts from the partial pre-interpretation satisfying all previous constraints.

The second approach (finite domain solver) encodes the search for a pre-interpretation as a finite domain problem. A finite domain variable ranging over the domain of the pre-interpretation is associated with the terms occurring in the constraints and boolean variables are used to express the equality between the pre-interpretation of different terms. We sketch the encoding using the even-odd example. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the domain of the pre-interpretation. A finite domain variable D_t ranging over $\mathcal{D}$ represents the pre-interpretation of a term t and boolean variables $B_{t_1=t_2}$ indicates whether or not the terms t_1 and t_2 have the same pre-interpretation. Such boolean variables are linked to the domain variables through definitions $B_{t_1=t_2} \leftrightarrow D_{t_1} = D_{t_2}$ which ensure propagation of new information. Consider the constraint `false` $\leftarrow$ `abduce(0,X)`, `abduce(s(0),X)`. To handle it we introduce finite domain variables D_0 and $D_{s(0)}$. We can translate the constraint to `false` $\leftarrow$ $D_0 = X$, $D_{s(0)} = X$ or, after elimination of X : `false` $\leftarrow$ $B_{0=s(0)}$ or $B_{0=s(0)} = 0$. To express the connection between 0 and $s(0)$, we add for all $d \in \mathcal{D}$ the constraint $B_{0=d} \leq B_{s(0)=s(d)}$ ¹. Note that this im-

¹ Or equivalently $B_{0=d} \rightarrow B_{s(0)=s(d)}$.

plies the creation of finite domain variables $D_{s(d)}$. Now consider the constraint $\text{subsumed}(\text{even}(Y) \leftarrow \text{abduce}(s(s(0)), Y), \{\text{even}(X) \leftarrow \text{abduce}(0, X), \})$. It contains a new term $s(s(0))$, so a domain variable $D_{s(s(0))}$ is created and it is linked with $D_{s(0)}$ by adding for all $d \in \mathcal{D}$ the constraint $B_{s(0)=d} \leq B_{s(s(0))=s(d)}$. The subsumption constraint is expressed as $B_{s(s(0))=0} = 1$. (Its negation is represented as $B_{s(s(0))=0} = 0$.) This translation ensures that all choices which are made are immediately propagated.

4.3 Failure analysis and symmetries

Consider the abductive system and the constraint system with the abductive solver. Chronological backtracking is triggered by the derivation of a **false**← clause. However, not all the components of the pre-interpretation abduced so far necessarily have contributed to its derivation. So, chronological backtracking may result in thrashing. The amount of backtracking can be substantially reduced. In the context of the abductive system, a simple approach is to associate with each clause the set of abductive facts used in its derivation. In each derivation step, the set associated with the new clause is the union of the sets of the two parent clauses. When abducting a new fact, the associated set is the abduced fact itself. In this way, when **false**← is derived, one obtains an associated *conflict set* identifying the abduced facts used in the derivation of the clause. Backtracking is then directed to the last abduced fact in the set. To support also the derivation of secondary conflict sets, the technique of intelligent backtracking [8] is used. With $S_1 \wedge \{\text{abduce}_f(\bar{s}, d1)\}$ a conflict set which backtracks to the generator of $\text{abduce}_f(\bar{s}, _)$, the conflict set $S_1 \wedge \{\text{abduce}_f(\bar{s}, d1)\}$ is stored with the generator of this abductive component. If it happens that all possible assignments for that component get rejected, then one obtains a set of conflicts which can be formalised as: $S_1 \wedge \{\text{abduce}_f(\bar{s}, d1)\} \rightarrow \text{false}, \dots, S_n \wedge \{\text{abduce}_f(\bar{s}, dn)\} \rightarrow \text{false}$. Applying hyper-resolution on these clauses and $\text{abduce}_f(\bar{s}, d1) \vee \dots \vee \text{abduce}_f(\bar{s}, dn)$, which expresses that there must be a domain element assigned to the term $f(\bar{s})$, one obtains the secondary conflict $S_1 \wedge \dots \wedge S_n \rightarrow \text{false}$ and one can backtrack to the most recent abducible in that set. Note that a trade-off between the time lost in rediscovering the same conflict set and the time and space lost in storing and checking previous conflict sets has to be made. It is done by storing the conflict set with the generator of the most recent abduced fact present in the conflict set. This approach avoids inefficiencies in accessing relevant conflict sets. However, if, due to another conflict, one backtracks beyond that generator, then the information about the conflicts stored with it is lost. Notwithstanding that this conflict set still can have potential use for future pruning.

The conflict sets obtained in this way are not optimal. In fact, as Peltier [24] points out, it is not feasible to compute optimal conflict sets: if there is no model for the given domain size, the optimal conflict set is empty. However further improvements are feasible. For example, consider the clause **false**← **t1** = **t2**, **Y** = **t3**. It leads to the clause **false**← whenever the pre-interpretations of **t1** and **t2** are equal. However, our approach will also include the components

used in computing the pre-interpretation of t_3 . Improved failure analysis could be achieved by applying substitutions. Indeed for any expression E , the (pre-) interpretation of $E, X = t$ for which X does not occur in t is equal to the (pre-) interpretation of $E\{X/t\}$. The abductive constraint solver uses this rule to simplify $\text{false} \leftarrow \text{Abds}$ constraints. The abductive procedure does not use it as it performs abstract compilation as a pre-processing step and the integration of this optimisation would require a complete redesign of the system (one should keep track of the used components of the pre-interpretation at the level of individual terms instead of at the clause level). The abductive constraint solver also sharpens the conflict set of violated subsumption constraints: it selects an argument for which the subsumption constraint is violated and returns as conflict set the components used in evaluating that argument.

As noted by Peltier [24], applying a permutation of the domain on a partial (pre-) interpretation yields an isomorphic (pre-) interpretation. It can be extended into a model iff the original one can be extended in a model. In particular, if S is a conflict set, so is $S\{d_1/d'_1, \dots, d_n/d'_n\}$ with $\{d'_1, \dots, d'_n\}$ a permutation of $\{d_1, \dots, d_n\}$. There is again a trade-off between the time lost in rediscovering an isomorphic conflict and in storing and using such conflicts to prune the search. We follow what we understand to be the approach in [24]: when a conflict set is found and the system backtracks and considers the next candidate, it is checked whether that candidate has a subset which is isomorphic to the conflict set which triggered the backtracking. For example, assume a conflict $\{abduce_f(d1, d1), abduce_a(d2)\}$ is derived and the enumeration modifies the second component in $abduce_a(d3)$. The new partial pre-interpretation contains the set $\{abduce_f(d1, d1), abduce_a(d3)\}$ which is isomorphic to the original one under the permutation $\{d3/d2, d2/d3\}$ and is rejected. Note that $\{abduce_f(d2, d2), abduce_a(d1)\}$ is also isomorphic to the original conflict set. While it can be part of a candidate still to be explored in the search space, this conflict set is not stored for future pruning.

5 Alternative approaches

Model generation. The logic program and the clause $\text{false} \leftarrow \text{query}$ can be considered as a logical theory. A model of this theory is a proof that the query fails. There exist general purpose tools for generating models of logical theories. FINDER [27,28], written in C, is such a tool; it takes as input a set of clauses in a many-sorted first order language, together with specifications of finite cardinalities of the domains for the sorts, and generates interpretations on the given domains which satisfy all the clauses [27]. A basic difference with our approach is that it not only enumerates the pre-interpretation but also the interpretation (the mapping from the atoms to true or false). Also, it is not goal directed; the system checks whether all ground instances of all clauses are true in the candidate interpretation. If a clause instance is found which is false, then the components of the interpretation which have been used in the evaluation make up what we called the conflict set and are used to direct the search (using hyper-resolution

as described in Section 4.3 to derive secondary conflicts). Another difference is that FINDER stores conflict sets permanently (unless they are too big) and uses elaborate algorithms to exploit them efficiently in pruning the search. FINDER reports a model when it discovers an interpretation which is true for all clause instances. FINDER uses a typed language and can only handle binary predicates and functors. To overcome that restriction we used a special encoding for predicates and functors of higher arity. For example, with n the size of domain D and $f/3$ a ternary functor, we introduce a domain D_h with cardinality $n \times n$, a binary functor $f_h : D \times D \rightarrow D_h$, and a binary functor $f_b : D_h \times D \rightarrow D$. Then we replace every occurrence $f(t_1, t_2, t_3)$ by $f_b(f_h(t_1, t_2), t_3)$. In addition $f_h/2$ should have a different value for each different input and FINDER should not backtrack over the choices made for $f_h/2$. This can be achieved with declaring f_h injective and ensuring that the choice points for $f_h/2$ are created first. [28] states that the order in which functors are declared is important and that the first declared ones change least rapidly during the backtracking. The first results we obtained with FINDER [9] were rather poor. The results reported in the current paper are much better. They are obtained with the ordering which places the special functor f_h first, then the constants, then the other functors and finally the predicates.

In a recent paper, Peltier [24] presents a new system FMC_{ATINF} which claims to do a better failure analysis than FINDER and SEM [35], and exploits symmetries to further improve the pruning of the search space. As with other finite model builders for first order logic, it enumerates the full interpretation, not only the pre-interpretation. Our understanding is that the concept of *covering refutation* used to prune the search is very similar to our use of intelligent backtracking (which we added to our system described in [9] after we learned about the work of Peltier).

Regular approximations. Within the context of program analysis, the most obvious approach to prove failure is to add a clause $\text{shouldfail}(\overline{X}) \leftarrow \text{query}(\overline{X})$ and to use one or another kind of type inference to show that the success-set of $\text{shouldfail}(\overline{X})$ is empty. A typical representative of such systems is described in [19]; it computes a regular approximation of the program. Roughly speaking, for each argument of each predicate, the values it can take in the success-set² are approximated by a type (a canonical unary logic program). Failure of the query is proven if the types of $\text{shouldfail}(\overline{X})$ are empty. Also set based analysis [20] can be used to approximate the success-set. Set-based analysis originates from [23]; it was then studied (improved and implemented) in [20]. The tool that we use is a composition of inference of a directional type (as in [10], based on set-based analysis) with the theorem prover SPASS [34].

Program specialisation. One could also employ program transformation, and more specifically program specialisation techniques to prove failure of the query. If for the given query, the program can be specialised in the empty program,

² The set of ground atoms which are logical consequences of the program.

then the query trivially fails. A technique which has almost the same power as transformations based on the fold/unfold approach is conjunctive partial deduction [22,14]. By specialising conjunctions of atoms instead of single atoms, it can achieve substantially better results than other specialisers. For example it can specialise the even/odd program into the empty program for our example query.

6 Experiments

Table 1 gives details about the benchmarks³. Besides the name, the table gives the number of clauses (without the query), the number of predicates, the size of the domain, the size of a pre-interpretation, the number of different pre-interpretations (including symmetric ones), the size of an interpretation (the number of atoms to be mapped to true or false), and the number of different interpretations (for a fixed pre-interpretation).

name	#clauses	#pred	size(dom)	size(pre)	#pre	size(int)	#int/pre
odd_even	3	2	2	3	2^3	4	2^4
wicked_oe	4	3	2	10	2^{10}	10	2^{10}
appendlast	4	2	3	12	3^{12}	13	2^{13}
reverselast	4	2	3	12	3^{12}	13	2^{13}
nreverselast	6	3	5	28	5^{28}	150	2^{150}
schedule	12	6	3	12	3^{12}	24	2^{24}
multiset0	7	1	2	7	2^7	4	2^4
multiset1	4	2	2	7	2^7	12	2^{12}
blockpair2o	15	3	2	19	2^{19}	12	2^{12}
blockpair3o	15	3	2	36	2^{36}	20	2^{20}
blockpair2l	14	5	2	19	2^{19}	32	2^{32}
blockpair3l	14	5	2	36	2^{36}	40	2^{40}
blocksol	14	5	2	19	2^{19}	32	2^{32}
BOO019-1	4	1	3	32	3^{32}	9	1

Table 1. Properties of benchmark programs

odd_even is a trivial example about even and odd numbers. **wicked_oe** is an extension which adds a call to each clause and 4 functors which are irrelevant for success or failure. It allows us to see whether failure analysis is accurate enough to achieve the same level of pruning as in **odd_even**. **appendlast**, **reverselast**, **nreverselast** and **schedule** are small but hard examples. On one hand, they illustrate the use of integrity constraints to express program properties; on the other hand, they have circulated as challenging problems for program specialisers which should be able to specialise them into the empty program. The query for **appendlast** expresses the integrity constraint that appending a list ending

³ The code is available at <http://www.cs.kuleuven.ac.be/~henkv/pre>

in **a** cannot result in a list ending in a **b**. The query for **reverselast** expresses that reversing a list with the accumulating parameter initialised as **[a]** cannot result in a list ending in a **b**. The query for **nreverselast** expresses naive reverse applied on a list beginning with an **a** cannot result in a list ending in a **b**. Finally, the **schedule** program is a program that attempts to transpose successive positions in a list of elements until a configuration is reached with two successive **c** elements. The query expresses the integrity constraint that such configuration cannot be reached from a configuration consisting of one **c** followed by one or more **n**. **multiset0** and **multiset1** are programs to check the equivalence of two multisets. While the first uses a binary operator “o” to build sets, the second uses a list representation and auxiliary predicates to manipulate the list. The others are typical examples from a large set of planning problems reasoning on multisets of resources. The first two use the “o” representation for the multiset, the next two the “l” (list) representation. **blockpair2o** and **blockpair2l** omit the for success or failure irrelevant argument for collecting the plan (and have 6 functors less). **blocksol** is there to show what happens when the query does not fail. It uses the list representation and also omits the argument collecting the plan. Finally, **B00019-1** is an axiomatisation of a ternary boolean algebra, a typical problem from the theorem proving community taken from the TPTP library [29]). Its only predicate is equality, whose interpretation can be fixed to the identity (so the number of different interpretations is only 1 instead of 2^9).

The abductive system AB uses the control as described in Section 4.1 and is augmented with the intelligent backtracking and symmetry checking as described in Section 4.3. The constraint system gives lowest priority to rule 5 which create a choice point. Rule 4 which checks for consistency of the constraints is activated each time a new constraint is generated. The system with the abductive solver (ABCS) also uses intelligent backtracking and is able to derive more accurate conflict sets than AB. The system with the finite domain solver (FDCS) does not apply intelligent backtracking as this is difficult to integrate with the standard pruning techniques of finite domain solvers [32]. Both constraint systems eliminate only the most obvious symmetry in the search space (when starting the enumeration with **abduce_a(X)** they will consider only one domain value for **X**).

The abductive systems are implemented in Prolog. The queries have been executed with MasterProlog on a SUN sparc Ultra-2. The constraint system FDCS is also written in Prolog, uses the SICSTUS finite domain solver and was running under SICSTUS Prolog [30] on the same machine. ABCS was also running under SICSTUS Prolog. FINDER is implemented in C and was also running on a SUN sparc Ultra-2. Regular approximations (RA) were computed with a system due to John Gallagher, conjunctive partial deduction (CPD) with a system due to Michael Leuschel. Witold Charatonik was so kind to run our examples on his tool for set based analysis (SBA) described in Section 5. Finally, Nicolas Peltier was so kind to run our examples on the FMC_{ATINF} system [24] under a SUN4 ELC.

Table 2 gives the times for the various systems. The times are in seconds, unless followed by H, in which case it is in hours. The notation $> xH$ means no solution was found after x hours; M means out of memory. For CPD, RA and SBA, we do not give times as these systems do not perform an exhaustive search but a standard analysis of the given program. *yes* means failure was proven. As **blocksol** does not fail, it was not run on these systems.

Table 3 gives the number of backtracks. For the constraint systems, two numbers are given, #bckt is the number of backtracks inside the solver, i.e. those with respect to the pre-interpretation, #Tbckt is the number with respect to the choices made regarding tabling.

name	AB	FDCS	ABCS	FINDER	FMC	CPD	RA	SBA
odd_even	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	yes	yes	yes
wicked_oe	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.01	yes	yes	yes
appendlast	0.53	0.45	0.09	0.17	45.21	yes	no	yes
reverselast	0.38	3.70	0.94	0.17	10.79	no	no	yes
nreverselast	5.87H	>19H	>19H	>16.5H	>900	yes	no	no
schedule	0.10	0.31	0.07	0.03	0.15	no	no	yes
multiset0	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	no	yes	yes
multiset1	0.01	0.06	0.03	0.02	0.08	yes	no	yes
blockpair2o	1.83	0.38	0.11	0.08	7.31	no	no	no
blockpair3o	7.60	0.42	0.14	0.18	>900	no	no	no
blockpair2l	2.83	2.36	1.17	0.05	204.9	no	no	no
blockpair3l	29.24	2.49	1.34	0.12	M	no	no	no
blocksol	200.78	7.7H	2558.58	1896.3	>900	-	-	-
BOO019-1	1.20	4.34	0.14	0.03	0.06	no	no	no

Table 2. Times.

6.1 Discussion

One should refrain from comparing results for individual examples. A different order over the choice points can give a very different result. This is definitely so for FINDER, which imposes an almost static ordering over the choice points. The order used in [9] was giving much worse results. The abductive system AB determines the order dynamically. Still, a small change in the heuristics for selecting the next rule application can result in a different order over the choice points and in substantially different results. For example, a variant of the AB system solved **blockpair3l** in 2.60s with 18 backtracks (but was doing worse when considering the whole benchmark suite).

The effects of pruning based on symmetries in the AB system is not reported in the tables. Of the problems with 2 element domains, it triggers only one pruning step in **blocksol** which has to search the whole solution space. It causes one pruning step in each of the problems with 3 element domains, but makes the

name	AB	FDCS		ABCS		FINDER	FMC
	#bcktr	#bcktr	#Tbcktr	#bcktr	#Tbcktr	#bcktr	#bcktr
odd_even	4	0	0	0	0	1	3
wicked_oe	64	0	0	0	0	8	52
appendlast	43	24	1	55	1	618	110019
reverselast	30	68	2	303	2	614	23445
nreverselast	190170	?	?	?	?	$> 5.10^7$	?
schedule	24	13	1	106	1	37	497
multiset0	10	7	0	30	0	0	104
multiset1	3	6	1	21	1	12	469
blockpair2o	17	25	0	49	0	262	5567
blockpair3o	56	25	0	51	0	879	?
blockpair2l	28	3943	2	2733	2	68	91404
blockpair3l	130	4009	2	2737	2	366	?
blocksol	3615	1396146	385	1970544	169	4007523	?
BOO019-1	72	4	0	34	0	14	33

Table 3. Amount of backtracking.

difference on **nreverselast** where a 5 element domain is needed to construct a model. There, it causes 120 pruning steps in the search space of the AB system.

Comparing the twin problems **odd_even** and **wicked_oe**, **blockpair2o** and **blockpair3o**, **blockpair2l** and **blockpair3l**, we observe that FDCS with the finite domain solver is almost not distracted by the (for the failure) irrelevant extra functors. Apparently, its control strategy is such that those extra functors are enumerated as the last ones, when the more constrained functors already received a correct assignment in the domain of the pre-interpretation. Also the failure analysis of the abductive solver ABCS turns out to be very accurate and the amount of backtracking is almost unaffected by the extra functors. The failure analysis of the abductive system AB includes those functors in conflict sets so that the backtracking becomes less accurate and more backtracks occur before a solution is found. This also holds for the model generators FINDER and FMC_{ATINF}.

The abductive system AB is the only system solving all problems and is doing very well in terms of number of backtracks (apart from **wicked_oe** and **BOO019-1**). Its implementation is very straightforward (linear lists for clauses, abducted facts and tabled answers), so there is a lot of room for improving its speed. As a consequence it is often slower than the constraint systems. The latter, also implemented in Prolog, use more elaborate data structures.

Both constraint systems FDCS and ABCS are doing pretty well. Although they are also implemented in Prolog, they use more elaborate data structures and are often faster than AB, even when they need more backtracks. Their performance degrades when they have to backtrack frequently over their decision with respect to the subsumption of new answers (**#Tbcktr**). This is a major weakness. The more they have to backtrack over the subsumption decisions, the

more the size of their search space becomes close to that of the model generators FINDER and FMC_{CATINF}. A problem is that they have no control over the order of these choice points and cannot do better than chronological backtracking over all possibilities. This problem is prominent in **blocksol** where they have to search the whole space of interpretations of size $2^{19} \times 2^{32}$ whereas AB searches in the space of pre-interpretations of size 2^{19} . The poor performance in this problem is not a real drawback. The use of the model generator should be combined with the use of a theorem prover which should be able to find a plan for **blocksol**. We suspect this problem is at the basis of their failure on the **nreverselast** problem where the domain size is 5. A positive point is that answer lemmas can contain variables, in which case they cover several ground answers. This limits somewhat the number of different answer sets which have to be considered during the search. (FINDER needs much more backtracks on the **blocksol** problem.)

Whereas our original results [9] confirmed those of [24] that FMC_{CATINF} most of the time outperforms FINDER, more fine tuning of the FINDER input reversed the picture. Its implementation in C and its use of specialised data structures pays off on the class of problems we consider. It is fast on all but the hard problems. In **blocksol** it is beaten by AB (over 4 million backtracks against 3615 for AB) and it was stopped on **nreverselast** after 50 million backtracks. FINDER is pre-processing short clauses. Likely this eliminates a lot of candidate solutions (it solves **multiset0** without backtracking). FMC_{CATINF}, which has no such pre-processing, is unable to solve several problems, in particular the planning problems with a list representation. The latter problems are those where the reduction of search space by our approach (the space of pre-interpretations versus the space of interpretations —see last column in Table 1—) is largest.

The advantage for our systems that they search the smaller space of pre-interpretations disappears on the TPTP problem **B00019-1** and similar problems. Hence the first order model generators do as well or better in terms of number of backtracks and, due to their fine tuned C implementations, outperform our systems in speed.

Conjunctive partial deduction can handle some of the problems which are difficult for us, but cannot handle any of the planning problems. Computing regular approximations is fast, but it can show failure of the most simple problems only. The set based analyser is more precise and fails only on the planning problems, **nreverselast** and **B00019-1**.

7 Conclusion

For definite logic programs, we have addressed the problem of proving that certain queries cannot succeed with an answer. A problem which is particularly relevant when the query does not fail finitely. We have developed two new approaches which aim at searching a model of the program in which the query is false. We have performed some experiments using (rather small) example pro-

grams and queries which do not terminate⁴. We also did a comparison with other approaches which could be used to tackle this problem: general purpose model generation tools, the use of type inference, and the use of program specialisation. In the case of type inference, the approach is in fact also to compute a model. However, the chosen model is the one which best reflects the type structure of the program. If the query happens to be false in this model, then failure is shown. Also in the case of program specialisation, showing failure is a byproduct of the approach: for some queries, the program happens to be specialised into the empty program.

Abduction is a very powerful and general problem solving technique. It was pretty easy to formulate the problem of searching a pre-interpretation such that the query is false in the least model based on it as an abductive problem and to use a general purpose abductive procedure[16]. But we quickly realised that we had almost no control over the search for a solution. Our first approach was to build a special purpose abductive procedure for definite programs which employs tabulation and which hard wired the constraints that pre-interpretation of functors are total functions. The idea behind the proof procedure is to use a top-down evaluation strategy —abducting a part of the pre-interpretation only when needed in evaluating the query— and to prevent looping by the use of tabulation. Experiments confirmed our intuition that it was important to delay the abduction of new components in the pre-interpretation as long as possible (to propagate all consequences of what was already abducted to check whether it was part of a feasible solution). After adding failure analysis to improve upon chronological backtracking as in systems as `FMCATINF` [24] and `FINDER` [27,28], the system is doing quite well. It outperforms `FMCATINF` in speed and number of backtracks. Compared with `FINDER`, it typically needs much less backtracks, though it can only beat `FINDER` in speed for a couple of hard problems.

We also explored a variant which treats the definition of the pre-interpretation as constraints. This allows to delay the decisions up to the point where answers had to be tabled: at such a point one needs to know whether the answer is new or not. Still we do not fix the pre-interpretation at such a point but formulate constraints on the pre-interpretation, using a solver to check the existence of a pre-interpretation satisfying all constraints. We experimented with a finite domain solver and with an abductive solver. We obtained good results; however the systems start to slow down when a lot of backtracking over the decisions with respect to new answers being subsumed by the existing ones is needed. The number of possible backtracks quickly goes up with the arity of the predicates, as the example `blocksol`, where the query does not fail, illustrates. It also increases quickly with the size of the domain needed to show failure e.g. `nreverselast`. Unless one finds some heuristics to control the order of choice points, or some knowledge to do better than the chronological backtracking over these choice points, the abductive system seems more promising.

⁴ These programs also loop when using tabulation or when executing bottom-up after a magic set transformation.

Our experiments indicate that our approach is a better basis for proving failure of queries over definite programs than applying general purpose model generators such as FINDER and FMC_{ATINF}. Searching the space of pre-interpretations for a pre-interpretation such that the query is false in the least model based on it requires on average much less backtracking than searching the larger space of interpretations. Searching in the smaller space of pre-interpretations has a cost: the query needs to be evaluated in the least model. Tabulation turned out to be a very effective approach which keeps the cost of the query evaluation at acceptable levels. (As the program abstracted under the pre-interpretation is a DATALOG program, also loop checking can ensure termination of the query evaluation. At some point we experimented with this and got a very large slow down as the number of derived clauses substantially increased.)

Our approach is also more powerful than type inference based on Regular Approximations. Conjunctive Partial Deduction and Set Based Analysis turn out to be quite powerful on some classes of problems but cannot solve any of the planning problems.

A limitation of our approach, but also of the model generators is that they cannot prove failure if the query is only false in a model based on an infinite domain. For example $\text{less}(N, s(N)) \leftarrow$ and $\text{less}(N, s(M)) \leftarrow \text{less}(N, M)$ and the query $\leftarrow \text{less}(N, M), \text{less}(M, N)$. Also set based analysis and conjunctive partial deduction are unable to prove failure of this query.

In a broader context, this paper makes contributions to the following topics:

- A (first) study of methods to prove (infinite) failure of definite logic programs.
- The development of a proof procedure which combines tabulation with abduction and of a constraint based procedure which treats the abducibles as constraints and uses a constraint solver to check the existence of a solution for the abducibles. Also the latter procedure uses tabulation.
- A better understanding of the power and limitations of abduction. While very expressive, our findings suggest that abductive procedures need to be augmented with “background” knowledge to direct the search for abductive solutions. Simply specifying the properties of an abductive solution as an integrity constraint cannot provide sufficient guidance to the search for a solution. It is interesting to observe that background knowledge is also often the key to success in Inductive Logic Programming which makes use of inductive procedures which are in more than one aspect “twins” of abductive procedures [1].
- The further development of model based program analysis. [18] showed that model based program analysis implicitly introduced in [12] is also an excellent method for type inference. In [18] it was shown that there exist pre-interpretations which encode various other declarative properties of programs. Our work takes this work one step further by developing methods for automatically constructing a pre-interpretation which expresses a particular program property (or integrity constraint) expressed as a query which should fail.

Acknowledgements

The author are grateful to the reviewers for the detailed comments and the many suggestions for improvement. M. Bruynooghe is supported by FWO-Flanders. This research was supported by the EC (a grant from the HCM project ER-BCHBGCT9303365 to D.A. de Waal), by the INTAS project 93-1702 *Efficient Symbolic Computing*, by the GOA projects *Non-Standard Application of Abstract Interpretation* and *LP+: a Second Generation Logic Programming Language* and by the FWO projects *Linguaduct* and *Knowledge Representation and Computation in Open Logic Programming*.

References

1. H. Ade and M. Denecker. Abductive inductive logic programming. In C.S. Mellish, editor, *Proc. of the International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 201–1209. Morgan Kaufman, 1995.
2. K.R. Apt, R.N. Bol, and J.W. Klop. On the safe termination of Prolog programs. In *Proc. ICLP'89*, pages 353–368, Lisbon, June 1989. MIT Press.
3. R.N. Bol, K.R. Apt, and J.W. Klop. An analysis of loop checking mechanisms for logic programs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 86(1):35–79, August 1991.
4. M.P. Bonacina and J. Hsiang. On rewrite programs: semantics and relationship with Prolog. *Journal of Logic Programming*, 14(1&2):155–180, October 1992.
5. A. Bossi, M. Gabbrielli, G. Levi, and M. Martelli. The s-semantics approach: Theory and applications. *J. Logic Programming*, 19/20:149–197, 1994.
6. D. Boulanger and M. Bruynooghe. A systematic construction of abstract domains. In *Proceedings SAS'94 (Static Analysis Symposium)*, LNCS 864, pages 61–77. Springer-Verlag, 1994.
7. D. Boulanger, M. Bruynooghe, and M. Denecker. Abstracting s-semantics using a model-theoretic approach. In *Proceedings PLILP'94 (Programming Language Implementation and Logic programming)*, LNCS 844, pages 432–446. Springer-Verlag, 1994.
8. M. Bruynooghe. Solving combinatorial search problems by intelligent backtracking. *Information Processing Letters*, 12(1):36–39, 1981.
9. M. Bruynooghe, H. Vandecasteele, D.A. de Waal, and M. Denecker. Detecting unsolvable queries for definite logic programs. In *Principles of Declarative Programming, Proc. PLILP'98, ALP'98*, LNCS 1490, pages 118–133. Springer-Verlag, 1998.
10. W. Charatonik and A. Podelski. Directional type inference for logic programs. In Giorgio Levi, editor, *Proceedings of the Fifth International Static Analysis Symposium (SAS)*, LNCS 1503, pages 278–294, Pisa, Italy, 1998. Springer-Verlag.
11. M. Codish and B. Demoen. Deriving polymorphic type dependencies for logic programs using multiple incarnations of prop. In *Proceedings SAS'94 (Static Analysis Symposium)*, LNCS 864, pages 281–296. Springer-Verlag, 1994.
12. M. Codish and B. Demoen. Analysing logic programs using “prop”-ositional logic programs and a magic wand. *Journal of Logic Programming*, 25(3):249–274, December 1995. First version in ILPS'93.
13. D. De Schreye and S. Decorte. Termination of logic programs: the never-ending story. *Journal of Logic Programming*, 19 & 20:199–260, May/July 1994.

14. D. De Schreye, R. Glück, J. Jørgensen, M. Leuschel, B. Martens, and M.H. Sørensen. Conjunctive partial deduction: foundations, control, algorithms and experiments. *J. Logic Programming*, 1999. To appear.
15. D.A. de Waal, M. Denecker, M. Bruynooghe, and M. Thielscher. The generation of pre-interpretations for detecting unsolvable planning problems. In U. Furbach, editor, *Proc. IJCAI Workshop on Model based Automated reasoning*, pages 103–112, 1997.
16. M. Denecker and D. De Schreye. SLDNFA: an abductive procedure for abductive logic programs. *Journal of Logic Programming*, 34(2):201–226, Februari 1998.
17. H. B. Enderton. *A Mathematical Introduction To Logic*. Academic Press, 1972.
18. J. Gallagher, D. Boulanger, and H. Sağlam. Practical model-based static analysis for definite logic programs. In J. Lloyd, editor, *Proc. ILPS'95*, pages 351–365, Portland, Oregon, December 1995. MIT Press.
19. J.P. Gallagher and D.A. de Waal. Fast and precise regular approximations of logic programs,. In P. Van Hentenryck, editor, *Proc. ICLP94*, pages 599–613. MIT Press, 1994.
20. N. Heintze. *Set based program analysis*. PhD thesis, School of Computer Science, Carnegie Mellon University, 1992.
21. A.C. Kakas, R.A. Kowalski, and F. Toni. Abductive logic programming. *J. Logic and Computation*, 2(6):719–770, 1992.
22. M. Leuschel, D. De Schreye, and D.A. de Waal. A conceptual embedding of folding into partial deduction: Towards a maximal integration. In Michael Maher, editor, *Proceedings of the Joint International Conference and Symposium on Logic Programming JICSLP'96*, pages 319–332, Bonn, Germany, September 1996. MIT Press.
23. P. Mishra. Towards a theory of types in Prolog. In *IEEE International Symposium on Logic Programming*, pages 289–298, 1984.
24. N. Peltier. A new method for automated finite model building exploiting failures and symmetries. *J. Logic and Computation*, 8(4):511–543, 1998.
25. K. Sagonas, T. Swift, and D.S. Warren. XSB as an efficient deductive database engine. In *Proceedings of SIGMOD 1994 Conf. ACM*. Acm Press, 1994.
26. Y.D. Shen. An extended variant of atoms loop check for positive logic programs. *New Generation Computing*, 15(2):187–203, 1997.
27. J. Slaney. FINDER: Finite domain enumerator system description. Technical Report TR-ARP-2-94, Centre for Information Science Research, Australian National University, Australia, 1994. Also in Proc. CADE-12.
28. J. Slaney. FINDER - finite domain enumerator - version 3.0 - notes and guide. Technical report, Centre for Information Science Research, Australian National University, Australia, 1997.
29. C.B. Suttner and G. Sutcliffe. The TPTP problem library, version 2.1.0, 15/12/1997. Technical Report 97/08, James Cook University, Australia, 1997.
30. Swedish Institute of Computer Science. *SICSTUS Prolog User's Manual*, November 1997.
31. H. Tamaki and T. Sato. OLD resolution with tabulation. In Ehud Shapiro, editor, *Proceedings ICLP'86*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 84–98, London, 1986. Springer-Verlag.
32. P. Van Hentenryck. *Constraint Satisfaction in Logic Programming*. The MIT press, 1989.
33. D.S. Warren. Memoing for Logic Programs. *Communications of the ACM*, 35(3):93–111, March 1992.

34. C. Weidenbach. SPASS version 0.49. *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, 18(2):247–252, 1997.
35. J. Zhang and H. Zhang. SEM: a system for enumerating models. In *Proc. IJCAI-95*, Vol. 1, pages 298–303. Morgan Kaufmann, 1995.

Appendix

7.1 Prolog code of examples

odd_even. Here and further on, the considered queries are the bodies of 0-arity predicates.

```
even(zero).
even(s(X)) :- odd(X).
odd(s(X)) :- even(X).
odd_even :- even(X), even(s(X)).
```

wicked_oe. A version of *odd_even* with an extra superfluous argument which creates a term with 4 different functors.

```
wicked_even(zero,U) :- wicked_p(U).
wicked_even(s(X),U) :- wicked_odd(X,_V), wicked_p(U).
wicked_odd(s(X),U) :- wicked_even(X,_V), wicked_p(U).
wicked_p(f(g(h(a))))).
wicked_oe :- wicked_even(X, _U1), wicked_even(s(X),_U2).
```

appendlast. Appending *[a]* to a list cannot yield a list ending in a *b*.

```
app([],L,L).
app([H|X],Y,[H|Z]) :- app(X,Y,Z).
last([X],X).
last([H,H2|T],X) :- last([H2|T],X).
appendlast:- app(X, [a], Xs), last(Xs, b).
```

reverselast. If the accumulator is initialised with a list ending in *a*, then the result of the call to reverse cannot be a list ending in a *b*.

```
last([X],X).
last([H,H2|T],X) :- last([H2|T],X).
reva([], Acc, Acc).
reva([Y|Z], R, Acc):- reva(Z, R, [Y|Acc]).
reverselast:- reva(L, R, [a]), last(R, b).
```

*nreverse*last. Reversing a list beginning with an *a* cannot result in a list ending in *b*.

```
rev([], []).
rev([X|Y], R):- rev(Y, S), app(S, [X], R).
app([], L, L).
app([H|X], Y, [H|Z]) :- app(X, Y, Z).
last([X], X).
last([H, H2|T], X) :- last([H2|T], X).
nreverselast :- rev([a|X], R), last(R, b).
```

schedule. There cannot be 2 *c*'s in a list with all *n*'s but the first element.

```
mv(R):- tr(R, NewR), mv(NewR).
mv(R):- atleast2c(R). % success iff R is non-safe state
tr([c, n|Rs], [n, c|Rs]).
tr([n|Rs], [n|NewRs]) :- tr(Rs, NewRs).
tr([], []).
cFirst([c|Qs]) :- nOnly(Qs).
nOnly([n|Qs]) :- nOnly(Qs).
nOnly([n]).
atleast2c([c|L]) :- atleast1c(L).
atleast2c([n|L]) :- atleast2c(L).
atleast1c([c|_]).
atleast1c([n|L]) :- atleast1c(L).
schedule :- cFirst(R), mv(R).
```

*multiset*o. A program to check that two multisets contain the same elements. The multiset is represented with a functor *o*/2 and a constant `emptyMultiSet`. This is more a specification than a program. It needs iterative deepening to find answers.

```
sameMultiSet(X, X).
sameMultiSet(o(X, Y), o(X, Z)) :- sameMultiSet(Y, Z).
sameMultiSet(o(o(X, Y), Z), U) :- sameMultiSet(o(X, o(Y, Z)), U).
sameMultiSet(U, o(o(X, Y), Z)) :- sameMultiSet(U, o(X, o(Y, Z))).
sameMultiSet(o(emptyMultiSet, X), Y) :- sameMultiSet(X, Y).
sameMultiSet(X, o(emptyMultiSet, Y)) :- sameMultiSet(X, Y).
sameMultiSet(o(X, Y), Z) :- sameMultiSet(o(Y, X), Z).
multiset0 :- sameMultiSet(o(a, o(a, emptyMultiSet)),
                        o(_X, o(emptyMultiSet, b))).
```

*multiset*l. The same problem as a normal Prolog program using lists. The query `m1` corresponds to the query `m1`. It does not terminate due to the presence of the variable.

```

sml([], []).
sml([X|Y], D) :- delete(X, D, E), sml(Y, E).
delete(M, [M|T], T).
delete(M, [H|T], [H|L]) :- delete(M, T, L).
multiset1 :- sml([a], X), sml(X, [b]).

```

blockpair2o. A number of planning problems based on a planner due to Michael Thielsher which operates on a multiset of resources. It has to be executed under iterative deepening to find plans for most problems (which have a solution).

In the first problem, the argument collecting the plan—which is irrelevant for the existence of a solution—is omitted. The multisets are represented using a constant for the empty set and a binary operator.

```

causesPair(I1, I2) :- sameMultiSet(I1, I2).
causesPair(I, G) :- actionPair(C, E), sameMultiSet(o(C, Z), I),
    causesPair(o(E, Z), G).
actionPair(ho(V), o(ta(V), o(cl(V), em))).
actionPair(o(cl(V), o(ta(V), em)), ho(V)).
actionPair(o(ho(V), cl(W)), o(on(V, W), o(cl(V), em))).
actionPair(o(cl(V), o(on(V, W), em)), o(ho(V), cl(W))).
actionPair(o(on(V, W), o(cl(V), em)),
    o(on(s(s(V)), s(V)), o(on(s(V), V), o(on(V, W),
    o(cl(s(s(V))), em)))).
actionPair(o(on(s(s(V)), s(V)), o(on(s(V), V), o(on(V, W),
    o(cl(s(s(V))), em)))),
    o(on(V, W), o(cl(V), em))).
sameMultiSet(X, X).
sameMultiSet(o(X, Y), o(X, Z)) :- sameMultiSet(Y, Z).
sameMultiSet(o(o(X, Y), Z), U) :- sameMultiSet(o(X, o(Y, Z)), U).
sameMultiSet(U, o(o(X, Y), Z)) :- sameMultiSet(U, o(X, o(Y, Z))).
sameMultiSet(o(emptyMultiSet, X), Y) :- sameMultiSet(X, Y).
sameMultiSet(X, o(emptyMultiSet, Y)) :- sameMultiSet(X, Y).
sameMultiSet(o(X, Y), Z) :- sameMultiSet(o(Y, X), Z).
blockpair2o :-
    causesPair(o(on(s(nul), nul), o(ta(nul), o(cl(s(nul)), em))),
        o(on(s(s(nul)), s(nul)), o(on(s(nul), nul), o(ta(nul),
        o(cl(s(s(nul))), em)))).

```

blockpair3o. Same problem but with the extra argument to collect the plan.

```

causesPair(I1, void, I2) :- sameMultiSet(I1, I2).
causesPair(I, plan(A, P), G) :- actionPair(C, A, E),
    sameMultiSet(o(C, Z), I), causesPair(o(E, Z), P, G).

actionPair(ho(V), put_down(V), o(ta(V), o(cl(V), em))).
actionPair(o(cl(V), o(ta(V), em)), pick_up(V), ho(V)).

```

```

actionPair(o(ho(V),cl(W)),stack(V,W),o(on(V,W),o(cl(V),em))).
actionPair(o(cl(V),o(on(V,W),em)),unstack(V),o(ho(V),cl(W))).
actionPair(o(on(V,W),o(cl(V),em)),add_two,
           o(on(s(s(V)),s(V)), o(on(s(V),V),
           o(on(V,W), o(cl(s(s(V))),em)))).
actionPair(o(on(s(s(V)),s(V)), o(on(s(V),V),
           o(on(V,W), o(cl(s(s(V))),em)))),
           delete_two,
           o(on(V,W), o(cl(V),em))).
sameMultiSet(X, X).
sameMultiSet(o(X, Y), o(X, Z)):- sameMultiSet(Y, Z).
sameMultiSet(o(o(X, Y), Z), U):- sameMultiSet(o(X, o(Y, Z)), U).
sameMultiSet(U, o(o(X, Y), Z)):- sameMultiSet(U, o(X, o(Y, Z))).
sameMultiSet(o(emptyMultiSet, X), Y):- sameMultiSet(X, Y).
sameMultiSet(X, o(emptyMultiSet, Y)):- sameMultiSet(X, Y).
sameMultiSet(o(X, Y), Z):- sameMultiSet(o(Y, X), Z).
blockpair3o:-
    causesPair(o(on(s(nul),nul), o(ta(nul), o(cl(s(nul)),em))),
               _Plan,
               o(on(s(s(nul)),s(nul)),o(on(s(nul),nul),o(ta(nul),
               o(cl(s(s(nul))),em)))).

```

blockpair2l. The next planner represents resources as a list. No argument to collect the plan.

```

causesPair1(I,I).
causesPair1(I,G) :- actionPair1(C,E), m_subset(C,I,Z), app(E,Z,S),
                   causesPair1(S,G).
actionPair1([ho(V)], [ta(V),cl(V),em]).
actionPair1([cl(V),ta(V),em], [ho(V)]).
actionPair1([ho(V),cl(W)], [on(V,W),cl(V),em]).
actionPair1([cl(V),on(V,W),em], [ho(V),cl(W)]).
actionPair1([on(V,W),cl(V),em],
            [on(s(s(V)),s(V)),on(s(V),V),on(V,W),cl(s(s(V))),em]).
actionPair1([on(s(s(V)),s(V)),on(s(V),V),on(V,W),cl(s(s(V))),em],
            [on(V,W),cl(V),em]).
m_subset([], L, L).
m_subset([H|T], L1, L2):- delete(H, L1, L3), m_subset(T, L3, L2).
delete(M, [M|T], T).
delete(M, [H|T], [H|L]):- delete(M, T, L).
app([], X, X).
app([X|Y], Z, [X|W]):- app(Y, Z, W).
blockpair2l :-
    causesPair1([on(s(0),0),ta(0),cl(s(0)),em], Sequence),
    m_subset([on(s(s(0)),s(0)),on(s(0),0),ta(0),
               cl(s(s(0))),em], Sequence, []).

```

blockpair3l. With an extra argument to collect the plan.

```

causesPair1(I,void,I).
causesPair1(I,plan(A,P),G) :- actionPair1(C,A,E), m_subset(C,I,Z),
    app(E,Z,S), causesPair1(S,P,G).
actionPair1([ho(V)],put_down(V),[ta(V),cl(V),em]).
actionPair1([cl(V),ta(V),em],pick_up(V),[ho(V)]).
actionPair1([ho(V),cl(W)],stack(V,W),[on(V,W),cl(V),em]).
actionPair1([cl(V),on(V,W),em],unstack(V),[ho(V),cl(W)]).
actionPair1([on(V,W),cl(V),em],add_two,
    [on(s(s(V)),s(V)),on(s(V),V),on(V,W),cl(s(s(V))),em]).
actionPair1([on(s(s(V)),s(V)),on(s(V),V),on(V,W),cl(s(s(V))),em],
    delete_two, [on(V,W),cl(V),em]).
m_subset([], L, L).
m_subset([H|T], L1, L2):- delete(H, L1, L3), m_subset(T, L3, L2).
delete(M, [M|T], T).
delete(M, [H|T], [H|L]):- delete(M, T, L).
app([], X, X).
app([X|Y], Z, [X|W]):- app(Y, Z, W).
blockpair1:-
    causesPair1([on(s(nul),nul),ta(nul),cl(s(nul))),em],
        _Plan, Sequence),
    m_subset([on(s(s(nul)),s(nul)),on(s(nul),nul),
        ta(nul),cl(s(s(nul))),em], Sequence, []).

```

blocksol. Finally a case where there exists a solution.

```

actionZero1([ho(V)], [ta(V), cl(V), em]).
actionZero1([cl(V), ta(V),em], [ho(V)]).
actionZero1([ho(V), cl(W)], [on(V,W), cl(V), em]).
actionZero1([cl(V), on(V, W), em], [ho(V), cl(W)]).
actionZero1([on(X, Y), cl(X), em],
    [on(s(X), X), on(X, Y), cl(s(X)),em]).
causesZero1(I, I).
causesZero1(I, G) :- actionZero1(C, E), m_subset(C,I, Z),
    app(E, Z, S), causesZero1(S, G).
m_subset([], L, L).
m_subset([H|T], L1, L2):- delete(H, L1, L3), m_subset(T, L3, L2).
delete(M, [M|T], T).
delete(M, [H|T], [H|L]):- delete(M, T, L).
app([], X, X).
app([X|Y], Z, [X|W]):- app(Y, Z, W).
blocksol :- causesZero1([on(s(0),0),ta(0),cl(s(0)),em],
    [on(s(s(0)),s(0)),on(s(0),0),ta(0),cl(s(s(0))),em]).

```

7.2 An example of input for FINDER

FINDER supports only nulladic, monadic and dyadic functions. As predicates are declared as functions with **boolean** as value sort, these restrictions also apply to predicate definitions and forces some transformation for predicates with arity > 2 : for example a ternary atom $p(t_1, t_2, t_3)$ is encoded as $p(t_1, \text{arg}_p(t_2, t_3))$ where $\text{arg}_p/2$ is a binary functor used to encode atoms with predicate $p/3$ and which constructs a term in a sort different from the sort of the terms t_1, t_2 , and t_3 of the original atom. To have the same expressivity as the original p based on a 2 element domain pre-interpretation, the pre-interpretation of arg_p has to be based on a 4 element domain.

Input for the `multiset1` problem. The ternary predicate `delete/3` has been converted in a binary `delete_was3/2` predicate. Besides the sort `term` for all terms of the original program, a sort `pair` has been introduced. The extra functor `delete_argpair` is used to bundle two terms of sort `term` into one of sort `pair`.

```
sort { term cardinality = 2.
      pair cardinality = 4.
    }

const {a: term.
      b: term.
      nil: term.
      ml1: bool.
    }

function { cons: term, term -> term.
          delete_argpair: term, term -> pair.
          delete_was3: term, pair -> bool.
          sml: term, term -> bool.
        }

clause {ml1 -> false.
      sml(cons(a, nil), z), sml(z, cons(b, nil)) -> ml1.
      sml(nil, nil).
      delete_was3(y, delete_argpair(w, z)), sml(x, z)
        -> sml(cons(y, x), w).
      delete_was3(z, delete_argpair(cons(z, y), y)).
      delete_was3(w, delete_argpair(x, z))
        -> delete_was3(w, delete_argpair(cons(y, x), cons(y, z))).
    }

setting {solutions: 1
        verbosity {models: brief    stats: full    job: brief
        }
```